

distributed differently. But I guess all I'm going to say is I would suspect that both will not pass. They may pass, but both will not become law, partly for the cost. I suspect here is where one should make the choice. If this is adopted, I will, obviously, offer the next amendment that I would not have otherwise done on the A bill because I do think it may well jeopardize the bill because of two subject matters. But aside from that, once that's done then it doesn't make any difference because one more amendment will not create any greater problem than would already be there. It was intended to provide a choice for two ways putting in, in total, \$12 million into the health care system and provide some reduction to the counties and their property tax requirements was the option in LB 525. The option that is being proposed to you now is to put in twice as much General Fund money with both being passed, as well as the federal funds. And I still have a lot of doubt in my mind that a cap will be effective. It takes one amendment to a bill to show, and experience I'm sure will show that the 7.5 million is way too low. The Appropriations Committee only became involved in this issue because part of the budget request from the Department of Social Services was increased provider fees, both the hospital and medical. That's how...it came as a budget request. The increase in fees was not included in the Governor's budget, but we did include that in LB 525, and we thought that it was an important thing to do. I still think it was an important thing to do, but I have a question in my mind whether both can be done even at a reduced level with the cap. So I'd urge that you give careful thought to the adoption of the amendment. Most of the problem I'm raising, if the bill itself was used, constitutional issue, it would essentially go away. And I'm sure there are those who feel that they probably don't have to worry about who's going to file a lawsuit. But the one person who doesn't have to file a lawsuit to raise a question is an opinion from the Attorney General.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore, for discussion, followed by Senators Langford and Scofield.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, I guess I really can't say much more. We all know that I'm actually opposed to LB 187. And I think by...once again I will compliment Senator Lynch and the folks behind this move, it's clever because you're getting a little more money. I still think you're making a rather large mistake, one, doing it with this measure, and, two, just as we usually do compromising up and spending just more dollars. And Senator